

[7] From: BHayes 6/6/91 3:38PM (1933 bytes: 31 ln)

To: BBrown

Subject: Methods, 600 series vs. 500 series

----- Message Contents -----

The problem identified in the letter from WJ English regarding the appropriate analytical method to use illustrates a long-standing issue; whether environmental (ie., ground water) samples should be analysed by drinking water methods, when drinking water exposure is the primary concern. The 500 series of analytical methods is used for monitoring the quality of public water supplies. These samples are usually very "clean" and are not subject to a lot of interference from other contaminants that might be present. The 600 series is usually specified for environmental samples, such as ground water or surface water. The 600 series would not be suitable for a public water system that was monitoring for compliance with MCLs under the Safe Drinking Water Act regulations.

Does monitoring for contamination at a public well, as part of a Superfund investigation, require 500 series analysis? Strictly speaking, I would say not. The advantage of the 500 series is that lower detection limits are possible. The disadvantage is that few contract labs are willing to go to the 500 series, especially if their contract says use the 600 series. The CLP requirements are for 600 series analyses, for instance. My impression is that this is a minor issue and shouldn't be the cause for any delay in the sampling plan. If the PRPs are willing to direct their contractor to use 500 series, that's OK, but I don't think it's necessary for us to insist upon it.

Later.

Bernie Hayes

EnSafe has agreed to use the 500 series - whether this is on all samples or not has not been discussed. It may be appropriate to use the 500 on the "clean" hits rather than all samples.



10663487